UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/942,016	08/29/2001	Wasim H. Chaudhuri	1-1	8997

7590   02/23/2005

Docket Administrator (Room 3J-219)
Lucent Technologies Inc.
101 Crawfords Corner Road
Holmdel, NJ 07733-3030

EXAMINER
HOANG, PHUONG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 August 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 - 20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 - 20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *28 January 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage

        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1 – 20 are pending for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2.   Claims 1 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

      a.   The following terms lack proper antecedent basis:

            i.   said base framework container interface, said base framework interface – claim 1;

            ii.   said base framework network entity interface object, said base framework network entity implement object – claim 2;

            iii.   said base framework action implementation abstract object – claim 3;

            iv.   said action classes – claims 11, 12, and 13;

            v.   said base framework container interface, said base framework interface, said network entity interface object – claim 14;

            vi.   said action classes – claim 20;

b.   The following claim languages are not clearly understood:

vii.   At claim 1, at line 13, it is not clearly understood that abstract

objects means (i.e., is it mean an abstract class); at lines 11 – 12, "said

base framework action container interface" is repeated twice in the

paragraph.

viii.   At claim 1, at lines 1 – 15, naming convention is similar and

confusing.

ix.   As to claim 14, at lines 1 – 21, naming convention is similar and

confusing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

3.   Claims 1 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter.

c.   As to claims 1 and 14, the claim recites an object model architecture for

providing network management for a telecommunication network having objects

and interfaces, action interfaces are being implemented by objects and class

object, but fails to recite functional elements as to enable the claimed object

model architecture for providing network management for a telecommunication

network to achieve some concrete, useful, and tangible results.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   **Claims 1 – 4, and 14 - 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Ismael, US patent no. 6,061,721 in view of Gavrilo, US patent

no. 6,675,227.

6.   **As to claim 1**, Isamael teaches an object model architecture for providing

network management of a telecommunications network (model for network

management system of telecommunication network, abstract and col. 4 lines 30 – 45

and col. 5 lines 1 – 10) comprising the steps of:

a base framework interface object (a managed object, col. 6 lines);

a base framework container interface object (a managed object adapter client,

col. 10 lines 1 – 10);

the interface being implemented by corresponding implementation abstract

objects (class) and said base framework network entity interface being implemented by

a base framework network entity implementation class object (class).

Ismael teaches the framework is a collection of classes and implemented in Java

(framework implemented in Java, col. 2 lines 20 – 25 and col. 5 lines 42 – 50).

Ismael does not explicitly teach all the name of the interfaces and theirs inherent in the framework.

Gavrilo teaches a framework implemented in Java language that provides the Java interface having the ability to inherit from another interface (an interface in the framework that has the ability to inherit from another interface, col. 1 line 55 – col. 2 lines 10 and col. 5 lines 20 – 40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ismael and Garvilo's system because Garvilo's interfaces would be named as base framework object container interface, base framework action container interface, and base framework action interface of the Ismael's framework in the network system, and the child interface can inherits the properties of the parent interface.

7.   **As to claim 2**, Ismael and Garvilo do not teach the step of wherein said base framework network entity interface object and said base framework network entity implementation object each inherit corresponding communication connection class object (connection, col. 4 lines 35 – 45).

8.   **As to claim 3**, Ismael modified by Garvilo teaches the step of wherein said base framework action interface and said base framework action implementation abstract

object each inherits corresponding action classes (Garvilo; interface like a class, can inherit from a parent class, col. 1 lines 32 – 65).

9.   **As to claim 4,** Ismael modified by Garvilo teaches the step of wherein said network entity interface inherits a base framework attribute container interface (Garvilo; child class inherit properties from a parent class, col. 1 lines 32 – 65).

10.   **As to claim 14,** this is the medium claim of claim 1 and 2. See rejection for claims 1 and 2 above.

11.   **As to claim 15,** see rejection for claim 4 above.

12.   **Claims 5 – 13, and 16 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ismael, US patent no. 6,061,721 in view of Gavrilo, US patent no. 6,675,227, and further in view of Hillard, US patent no. 6,697,856.**

13.   **As to claim 5,** Ismael and Varrilo do not teach the step of the connection classes are circuit classes.

        Hillard teaches the connection classes are circuit classes (circuit object, col. 5 lines 46 – 67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ismael, Garvilo, and Hillard's system because Hillard's connection would provide the cross-connect for communication between network elements in the telecommunication network, and Hillard's network management system also written in Java (col. 4 lines 20 – 30) would enable network elements being defined as classes and objects as the object-oriented style.

14.   **As to claim 6,** Hillard teaches the step of wherein said connection classes are logical port classes (circuit goes over a link from port 310A, col. 3 lines 48 – 66).

15.   **As to claims 7 and 8,** Ismael, Varrilo, and Hillard do not explicitly teach the steps of wherein said circuit classes include CircuitGenericEntityIfc, CircuitAxAtmIfc, CircuitAxCeIfc, CircuitAxFrameIfc, CircuitCoreAtmIfc, CircuitCoreCeIfc, CircuitCoreFrameIfc which represent interface objects for different types of sample Circuit objects and CircuitGenericEntityImpl, CircuitAxAtmImpl, CircuitAxCeImpl, CircuitAxFrameImpl, CircuitCoreAtmIImpl, CircuitCoreCeImpl, CircuitCoreFrameImpl classes represent implementations of the respective Circuit interface objects.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that there are needs for the circuit classes to implement many interfaces to provide fast communication and connection for the large network management system.

16.   **As to claims 9 and 10**, Ismael, Varrilo, and Hillard do not explicitly teach the

steps of wherein said logical port classes include LPortGenericEntityIfc,

LPortGeneralIfc, LportEthernetIfc, LPortILMIIfc, LPortNodeToNodeIfc, LPortPNNIIfc,

LportTrunkIfc which represent interface objects for the different types of sample Logical

Port objects and LPortGenericEntityImpl, LPortGeneralImpl, LPortEthernetImpl,

LPortILMIImpl, LPortNodeToNodeImpl, LPortPNNIImpl, LPortTrunkImpl classes

represent implementations of the respective Logical Port interface objects.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to recognize that there are needs for the logical port classes to

implement many interfaces to provide fast communication and connection for the large

network management system.

17.   **As to claims 11 - 13**, Ismael, Varrilo, and Hillard do not explicitly teach the steps

of wherein said action classes include a BFWGetOperationalInfoActionIfc, a

BFWGetPeriodicStatisticsActionIfc, a BFWGetStatisticsActionIfc, a

BFWStopStatisticsActionIfc, a BFWAddActionIfc, a BFWDeleteActionIfc, a

BFWGetActionIfc, a BFWListObjectByParentActionIfc, and a

BFWListObjectByTypeActionIfc interface object.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to recognize that there are needs for the action classes to

implement many objects to provide fast communication and connection for the large

network management system.

18.   **As to claims 16 and 17**, see rejection for claims 5 and 6 above.

19.   **As to claim 18**, see rejection for claim 7 above.

20.   **As to claims 19 and 20**, see rejection for claims 9 and 11 above respectively.

Conclusion

21.   The prior art made of record but not relied upon request is considered to be

pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

        Allavarpu, US patent no. 6,813,770, demonstrating a framework for network

management system.

        Alkhatib, US patent no. 6,119,171, demonstrating a method for domain name

router having network entity.

22.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Phuong N. Hoang whose telephone number is

(571)272-3763. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 am to

5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571)272-3756. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ph
February 16, 2005

MENG-AI T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100